



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/729,984	12/05/2000	Yisroel Lefkowitz	5016-2	8696

7590

08/12/2005

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

Suite 1210

551 Fifth Avenue

New York, NY 10176

EXAMINER

ALVAREZ, RAQUEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/729,984

Applicant(s)

LEFKOWITZ, YISROEL

Examiner

Raquel Alvarez

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-12,14-20 and 67-84 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2,4-12,14-20 and 67-84 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to communication filed on 5/2/2005.
2. Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-20 and 67-84 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-12, 14, 15, 17-20, 67-79, 81-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa, patent number 5,732,398 in view of Business Wire "Air France Corrects and Replaces Previous Announcement", 1/23/96.**

Tagawa teaches a method of selling international tickets in combination with duty free items comprising: offering at least one specific international ticket at a price below a then current price (col. 3, lines 25-35, col. 15, lines 55-60), acknowledging the purchase decision and accepting payment (col. 17, lines 25-35), delivering the ticket to the customer (col. 16, lines 10-25), advising the customer of the method of delivery of the duty free item (col. 18, lines 35-40). Tagawa also teaches offering one or more of a plurality of tickets to a variety of destinations (col. 6, lines 6-15), offering one or more of a plurality of duty free items (col. 18, lines 20-22) where the duty free items have differing assigned values as in a catalog, selecting at least one ticket from among a plurality of tickets and selecting at least one duty free item from among the plurality of items (col. 10, lines 60-65, col. 12, lines 30-45, col. 15, lines 25-50, col. 16, lines 40-50,

Art Unit: 3622

col. 18, lines 25-35),. Viewing itinerary and pricing information by accessing a web site over a computer network (col. 9, lines 63-65, col. 18, lines 47-60), viewing descriptive information concerning the duty free items by accessing a web site over a network (col. 9, 63-65, col. 18, lines 23-30),.making payment for the ticket by providing credit card information (col. 17, lines 25-35, col. 9, lines 18-20),. customer providing an address over the computer network (col. 18, lines 18, lines 35-40). Tagawa does not offer the ticket or the duty free item for at no additional cost with the purchase of the item or the ticket.

With respect to offering the duty free item at no additional cost. Air France teaches offering **free gifts and vouchers for duty free items** so therefore in the system of Air France it would have been obvious for the free gift to have been for the duty free items in order to motivate the customers to conduct business with the company.

With respect to the newly added feature of the offer being made over a computer network form a singe source. In the Kiosk of Tagawa, the users can purchase the travel tickets along with the duty-free items from main source which is the kiosk (see Figure 3).

With respect to the newly amended feature of offering a first type of product as an incentive to purchase a second type of product wherein the value of the first type of product varies as a function of the price of the second type of product. The Examiner wants to point out that since the combination of Tagawa and Air France teaches offering **free gifts/vouchers for duty free items for the purchase of airline tickets** and

the Examiner is taking official notice that it is old and well known that increasing the amount purchase will result in a bigger discount of a second item. For example, JC Penney and the like will provide a \$10.00 discount on purchases of \$50.00, and \$20.00 discount on purchases of \$75.00 and \$25.00 discount on purchases of \$100.00 or more therefore motivating the purchaser to increase the purchase amount in order to receive a larger incentive or discount on a second product. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Tagawa and Air France to include increasing the amount of a discount by a function of amount value of a product purchased because such a modification would provide the above mentioned advantage.

4. Claims 6, 16, 28, 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa in view of Business Wire "Air France Corrects and Replaces Previous Announcement" 1/23/96 further in view of Ong-Yeoh "Golden Boutique Set to Boost MAS Revenue", Business Times (Malaysia), 8/26/95.

Ong-Yeoh teaches advising the customer that the duty free items will be delivered to the customer at one of an international port of departure ("pre-order business where passengers can purchase their tickets and duty free items to be delivered at the airport). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have advised the customer of item delivery as in Ong-Yeoh in the system of Tagawa since the item delivery would have been adopted for the intended use of the pre-order business of Tagawa at least where the ticket and item inspection verifies eligibility of the duty free item.

Response to Arguments

5. With respect to the value of the product offered as incentive being determined as a function of the value of the item purchased. The Examiner is taking official notice that it is old and well known that increasing amount purchase will increase the discount of a second item. For example, JC Penney and the like will provide a \$10.00 discount on purchases of \$50.00, and \$20.00 discount on purchases of \$75.00 and \$25.00 discount on purchases of \$100.00 or more therefore motivating the purchaser to increase the purchase amount in order to receive a larger incentive or discount on a second product.

6. Applicant argues that there is no suggestion to adapt Tagawa so that one merchant who offers goods for sale through the kiosk is compelled to provide free (or discounted) goods from another type or group of merchants. The Examiner disagree with Applicant because on col. 4, lines 28-31 “**the method further comprises closing a sale, accepting payment for the flight or flights selected by the user and a delivering a non-Airline-Reporting Corporation value voucher for the paid flight or flights to the user”.**


7. Applicant argues that Air France doesn't teach that the value of the free item varies based on the price of the purchased item. The Examiner agrees with Applicant and wants to point out that although Air France doesn't teach the value of the free item varies based on the price of the purchased item. The Examiner wants to point out that it is old and well known to do. See rejection above.

Point of contact

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raquel Alvarez whose telephone number is (571)272-6715. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric w. Stamber can be reached on (571)272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Raquel Alvarez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

R.A.
8/3/2005